



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTY. DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	------------------

08/711,794 09/10/96 JOHNSON

P 96-0588

EXAMINER

35M1/0107

KAARADA & ASSOCIATES
IVAR M. KAARDAL
817 NORTH ELMWOOD AVENUE
SIOUX FALLS SD 57104-1942

PTA UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3504

DATE MAILED:

01/07/97

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

- ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☐ See the attached Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of Reference Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s) _____
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☒ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

—SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES—

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Moraly.

Sleeve (1a, 2a), wing members (1, 2), channel type cross section (fig. 10).

Claims 1-4 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Schirm.

Sleeve (16), wing members (34), wing angle of 90 degrees (fig. 4C).

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moraly.

The wing angle of 90 degrees is an obvious variation of the angle A in fig.

3.

Serial Number: 08/711794
Art Unit: 3504

-3-

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schirm in view of Deike.


Schirm does not show mounting holes. However, Deike teaches forming mounting holes (24) on the post sleeve to secure the post sleeve to the sign post. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Schirm's post stabilizer device with mounting holes on the post sleeve as taught by Deike to secure the post sleeve to the sign post.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Lionberger, Ashworth, Johnson, Holland, Deike '358 and Berger.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner L. Mai at telephone number (703) 308-2168.

L. Mai

01-02-97



LANNA MAI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 3500